

SYMPLECTIC, MULTISYMPLECTIC STRUCTURES AND EULER-LAGRANGE COHOMOLOGY

H.Y. Guo , Y.Q. Li, K. Wu¹

Institute of Theoretical Physics, Academia Sinica
P.O. Box 2735, Beijing 100080, China.

and

S.K. Wang²

Institute of Applied mathematics
Academy of Mathematics and Systems Sciences, Academia Sinica
P.O. Box 2734, Beijing 100080, China.

ABSTRACT

We study the Euler-Lagrange cohomology and explore the symplectic or multisymplectic geometry and their preserving properties in classical mechanism and classical field theory in Lagrangian and Hamiltonian formalism in each case respectively. By virtue of the Euler-Lagrange cohomology that is nontrivial in the configuration space, we show that the symplectic or multisymplectic geometry and related preserving property can be established not only in the solution space but also in the function space if and only if the relevant closed Euler-Lagrange cohomological condition is satisfied in each case. We also apply the cohomological approach directly to Hamiltonian-like ODEs and Hamiltonian-like PDEs no matter whether there exist known Lagrangian and/or Hamiltonian associated with them.

¹Emails: hyguo@itp.ac.cn; qylee@itp.ac.cn; wuke@itp.ac.cn

²Email: xyswsk@pku.edu.cn

CONTENTS

<i>1. Introduction</i>
<i>2. Euler-Lagrange Cohomology and Symplectic Structure Preserving in Classical Mechanism</i>
<i>2.1. Euler-Lagrange cohomology and symplectic structure preserving in Lagrangian mechanism</i>
<i>2.2 Euler-Lagrange cohomology and symplectic structure preserving in Hamiltonian formalism</i>
<i>3. Euler-Lagrange Cohomology and Multisymplectic Structure Preserving in Classical Field Theory</i>
<i>3.1 Euler-Lagrange cohomology and multisymplectic structure preserving for classical field theory in Lagrangian formalism</i>
<i>3.2 Euler-Lagrange cohomology and multisymplectic structure preserving for classical field theory in Hamiltonian formalism</i>
<i>4 Cohomological Approach to Hamiltonian-like ODEs, PDEs and Their Symplectic and Multisymplectic Properties</i>
<i>4.1 Symplectic cohomological approach to Hamiltonian-like ODEs and their symplectic structure preserving law</i>
<i>4.2 Symplectic cohomological approach to Hamiltonian-like PDEs and their multisymplectic structure preserving law</i>
<i>5. Remarks</i>
<i>Acknowledgements</i>
<i>References</i>

1 Introduction

It is well known that the symplectic and multisymplectic structures play important roles in the classical Hamiltonian mechanism [1] [2] as well as in the classical Lagrangian and/or Hamiltonian field theories [3] [4] [5] [6] [7] respectively. For a quite long period, in the usual standard approach, the symplectic or multisymplectic structure and their preserving properties have always been established in the solution space of the equation(s) of motion in each case. Very recently, however, it has been found that the symplectic structure and its preserving law in classical mechanics or the multisymplectic structure and its preserving law in classical scalar field theory hold not only in the solution space but also in the function space characterized by what has been named the Euler-Lagrange cohomology in each case [9] [10]. The Euler-Lagrange cohomology, in fact, not only provides some powerful concepts and method to study the symplectic or multisymplectic structures and their preserving properties in the classical mechanism and classical field theory but also opens up an important new research subject for further investigation. In fact, this Euler-Lagrange cohomology approach have already been generalized to the difference discrete cases and applied to the symplectic, multisymplectic algorithms [9] [10] [11] as well as the simple finite element method to find some symplectic or multisymplectic structure preserving properties in certain schemes derived from the finite element method [12] [13].

In the approach in [9] [10], the variation of the action functional had been dealt with in the traditional way in physics. However, the variation of the action functional may be treated as the derivative with respect to the free parameters as long as the free parameter space associated with the variation of the variables is introduced in the configuration space. As a matter of fact, it is quite common in some above-mentioned standard approaches to deal with the variation of given functional as the derivative with respect to one free parameter associated with the variation of the variables in the configuration space. Instead of introducing one free parameter in some standard approaches, we introduce a family of free parameters to describe the variation of the variables in all directions of the configuration space.

We also employ the conception of exterior differential calculus in the general function space (see, for example, [14]) as what have been implicated in [9] [10]. On the other hand, however, in order to more simply comprehend the exterior differential calculus in the general function space, we present in a simpler and more manifest way how to manipulate it by introducing an associated free parameter space with the functions at each point of base manifold and regarding the exterior differential calculus of the functions at this point as the differential calculus with respect to the free parameter space.

Therefore, the above two aspects, namely, the variation of the action functional etc and the exterior differentiation of the Lagrangian, Hamiltonian etc may be treated in a same framework as the first derivative and the second (exterior) derivative with respect to the free parameters as long as the parameter space associated with the variables at each point of the base manifold is introduced in the configuration space.

In this paper, we establish further in more rigorous and more evident way the geometric foundation for some relevant issues in [9][10], such as the Euler-Lagrange cohomology, its relation with the symplectic structure and its preserving property as well as its relation with the multisymplectic structure and its preserving property in classical mechanics and classical field theory for a set of generic fields in the Lagrangian formalism respectively. In addition, we establish in the Hamiltonian formalism the Euler-Lagrange cohomology, symplectic or multisymplectic structure and relevant conservation law for the classical mechanism and classical field theory for a set of generic fields. Furthermore, we also apply the Euler-Lagrange-like cohomological approach directly to certain types of ODEs and PDEs that may be called the Hamiltonian-like ODEs and the Hamiltonian-like PDEs no matter whether there exist the associated Lagrangian and/or Hamiltonian at all. We find that the cohomological scenario is available to so-called the Hamiltonian PDEs introduced in [4]. In fact, it is a type of Hamiltonian-like PDEs in the terminology of this paper.

The plan of this paper is as follows. We first re-derive some well-known content on symplectic structure and its preserving property for classical mechanism in Lagrangian formalism and Hamiltonian formalism respectively in section 2. The important issues of this section are about the free parameter differential calculus approach to the variation of the functional and to the exterior differential calculus of the functional in the generic function space, as well as the introduction of what has been called the Euler-Lagrange cohomology and relevant concepts and content in [9] [10] such as the Euler-Lagrange 1-forms, the coboundary Euler-Lagrange 1-forms, the Euler-Lagrange conditions and their role-played in order to explain those symplectic geometry and relevant preserving property for the classical mechanism in both the Lagrangian and Hamiltonian formalism. In the subsection 2.1. we first deal with the Lagrangian mechanism. Then in the subsection

2.2, we transfer to the Hamiltonian formalism. We show that the relevant Euler-Lagrange cohomology in each case is nontrivial and it is directly linked with the symplectic structure preserving law in classical mechanism. As a matter of fact, similar to the existence of symplectic structure, the symplectic structure preserving law in classical mechanism holds not only in the solution space of the Euler-Lagrange equation in Lagrangian formalism or the canonical equations in Hamiltonian formalism but also in the function space associated with the Euler-Lagrange cohomology in general. In section 3, we study the multisymplectic structure and its preserving property in classical field theory for a set of generic fields in the Minkowskian spacetime in both Lagrangian In the subsection 3.1, we first deal with the variation of the action functional as the differentiation with respect to multi-parameter in the configuration space. We also employ multi-parameter differential calculus approach to the exterior derivative in the generic function space to introduce the Euler-Lagrange cohomology in the Lagrangian formalism. We show that the nontriviality of the cohomology is directly linked with the nontriviality of the canonical 1-forms. We also prove that the necessary and sufficient condition for the multisymplectic structure and its preserving property, i.e. the conservation law, is the relevant Euler-Lagrange form being closed. Then in the subsection 3.2, we transfer to the Hamiltonian formalism by introducing the canonical conjugate field variables and making Legendre transformation. We also show that the nontriviality of the Euler-Lagrange cohomology and its relation with the multisymplectic structure and its conservation law in the Hamiltonian formalism. In the section 4, we apply the cohomological scenario directly to what we call certain types of Hamiltonian-like ODEs and of Hamiltonian-like PDEs. We show in the subsection 4.1 that the Euler-Lagrange-like cohomological scenario can be applied to certain types of Hamiltonian-like ODEs no matter whether there exist known associated Lagrangian and/or Hamiltonian. In the subsection 4.2, we emphasize that the Euler-Lagrange-like cohomological scenario can also be directly applied to certain types of Hamiltonian-like PDEs no matter whether there exist known associated Lagrangian and/or Hamiltonian for the systems. We show that the so-called Hamiltonian PDEs proposed by Bridges in [4] are just the ones in the type of Hamiltonian-like PDEs. For all these cases, the symplectic, multisymplectic structure and relevant conservation law not only exist in the solution space of the relevant equation(s) but also hold in the function space associated with the relevant cohomological condition. Finally, we end with some remarks in section 5.

2 Euler-Lagrange Cohomology and Symplectic Structure Preserving in Classical Mechanism

In this section, we recall some well-known content on symplectic structure and its preserving property in the Lagrangian and Hamiltonian formalism for the classical mechanism. The important point is to introduce the Euler-Lagrange cohomology associated with the Lagrangian functions and the Euler-Lagrange equation in Lagrangian formalism and the one in the Hamiltonian formalism. We explain their important roles in the symplectic structure and its preserving property in these formalisms.

2.1 Euler-Lagrange cohomology and symplectic structure preserving in Lagrangian mechanism

We begin with the Lagrangian mechanism. Let time $t \in R^1$ be the base manifold, M the n -dimensional configuration space on t with coordinates $q^i(t)$, ($i = 1, \dots, n$), TM the tangent bundle of M with coordinates $(q^i, \dot{q}^j)$, where $\dot{q}^j$ is the derivative of q^j with respect to t , $F(TM)$ the function space on TM .

The Lagrangian of the systems is denoted by $L(q^i, \dot{q}^j)$. The action functional along a curve $q(t)$ in M can be constructed by integrating of L along the tangent of the curve

$$S(q(t)) := \int_a^b L(q^i(t), \dot{q}^j(t)) dt. \quad (1)$$

Let us consider the case that both q^i and $\dot{q}^j$ variate by an infinitesimal increments such that the curve becomes a congruence of curves. Then at each moment of t in the congruence we can introduce the infinitesimal variations of q^i and $\dot{q}^j$ as follows

$$q_\epsilon^i(t) = q^i(t) + \epsilon^k \delta q_k^i(t), \quad \dot{q}_\epsilon^j = \dot{q}^j + \epsilon^k \delta \dot{q}_k^j, \quad (2)$$

where ϵ^k are n free parameters along the k -th direction in the configuration space, $\delta q_{\epsilon^k}^i(t)$ and $\delta \dot{q}_{\epsilon^k}^j(t)$ infinitesimal increments of $q_\epsilon^i(t)$ and $\dot{q}_\epsilon^j(t)$ at the moment t along the k -th direction in the congruence of curves:

$$\delta q_{\epsilon^k}^i(t) := \frac{d}{d\epsilon^k} \big|_{\epsilon^k=0} q_\epsilon^i(t) = \delta q_k^i(t), \quad \delta \dot{q}_{\epsilon^k}^j(t) := \frac{d}{d\epsilon^k} \big|_{\epsilon^k=0} \dot{q}_\epsilon^j(t) = \delta \dot{q}_k^j(t). \quad (3)$$

While the exterior derivatives of $q_\epsilon^i(t)$ and $\dot{q}_\epsilon^j(t)$ at the moment t in the congruence of curves are given by:

$$dq_\epsilon^i := \frac{\partial q_\epsilon^i}{\partial \epsilon^l} d\epsilon^l = d\epsilon^k \delta q_k^i, \quad d\dot{q}_\epsilon^j := \frac{\partial \dot{q}_\epsilon^j}{\partial \epsilon^l} d\epsilon^l = d\epsilon^k \delta \dot{q}_k^j. \quad (4)$$

In the congruence of curves, the Lagrangian also becomes a family of Lagrangian and the same for the action functional:

$$S(q(t)) \rightarrow S_\epsilon(q_\epsilon(t)) = \int_a^b L_\epsilon(q_\epsilon^i(t), \dot{q}_\epsilon^j(t)) dt, \quad (5)$$

where the upper-index k of ϵ^k is omitted.

Hamilton's principle, i.e. the least variational principle, seeks the curve along which the action S is stationary under variations of $q^i(t)$ with fixed endpoints. This can be manipulated by taking differentiation with respect to ϵ^k and setting $\epsilon^k = 0$ afterwards:

$$\delta S(q(t)) := \frac{d}{d\epsilon^k} \big|_{\epsilon^k=0} S_\epsilon(q_\epsilon(t)) = 0 \quad (6)$$

for all $\delta q_{\epsilon^k}^i(t) = \delta q_k^i(t)$ with $\delta q_k^i(a) = \delta q_k^i(b) = 0$.

It is simple to get the differentiation of the action with respect to ϵ^k

$$dS_\epsilon(q_\epsilon(t)) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \epsilon^k} \int_a^b (L(q_\epsilon^i(t), \dot{q}_\epsilon^j(t)) dt) d\epsilon^k = \int_a^b dq_\epsilon^i \left\{ \frac{\partial L_\epsilon}{\partial q_\epsilon^i} - \frac{d}{dt} \frac{\partial L_\epsilon}{\partial \dot{q}_\epsilon^i} \right\} dt + \frac{\partial L_\epsilon}{\partial \dot{q}_\epsilon^j} dq_\epsilon^j \big|_a^b. \quad (7)$$

Therefore, the variation of the action is given by

$$\delta S_\epsilon(t) = \int_a^b \delta q_{\epsilon^k}^i \left\{ \frac{\partial L}{\partial q^i} - \frac{d}{dt} \frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{q}^i} \right\} dt + \frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{q}^j} \delta q_{\epsilon^k}^j \Big|_a^b. \quad (8)$$

The last term in the above equation vanishes due to $\delta q_k^i(a) = \delta q_k^i(b) = 0$, so that the stationary requirement for S yields the Euler-Lagrange equations

$$\frac{\partial L}{\partial q^i} - \frac{d}{dt} \frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{q}^i} = 0. \quad (9)$$

It is obvious but important to see that in the above manipulation the variation of the action functional, δS_ϵ , is very closely linked with the differentiation of S_ϵ with respect to the free parameters ϵ^k in the congruence, i.e. dS_ϵ . Notice that the integrand in (7) for dS_ϵ and the boundary term are 1-forms with respect to $d\epsilon^k$. In addition, the differentiation with respect to ϵ^k may be viewed as an exterior derivative so that an exterior derivative operator d that is nilpotent with respect to ϵ^k in the congruence may be introduced.

The differentiation in the function space calculated for the action is in fact completely relied on the derivative of the family of Lagrangian functions

$$L_\epsilon := L(q_\epsilon^i(t), \dot{q}_\epsilon^i(t)), \quad (10)$$

with respect to ϵ^k . Therefore, it follows that

$$dL_\epsilon \Big|_{\epsilon^k=0} = \left\{ \frac{\partial L}{\partial q^i} - \frac{d}{dt} \frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{q}^i} \right\} dq_\epsilon^i + \frac{d}{dt} \left\{ \frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{q}^i} dq_\epsilon^i \right\}. \quad (11)$$

Let us from now on denote

$$dq^i := dq_\epsilon^i, \quad (12)$$

and define the Euler-Lagrange 1-form and the canonical 1-form θ on T^*M ,

$$E(q^i, \dot{q}^i) := \left\{ \frac{\partial L}{\partial q^i} - \frac{d}{dt} \frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{q}^i} \right\} dq^i, \quad (13)$$

$$\theta = \frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{q}^i} dq^i, \quad (14)$$

we have

$$dL_\epsilon(q_\epsilon^i, \dot{q}_\epsilon^i) \Big|_{\epsilon^k=0} = E(q^i, \dot{q}^i) + \frac{d}{dt} \theta. \quad (15)$$

From the definitions (13), (14) and the equation (15), it is easy to verify the following important issues.

First, the null Euler-Lagrange 1-form is corresponding to the Euler-Lagrange equation and the null Euler-Lagrange 1-form is a special case of the coboundary Euler-Lagrange 1-forms

$$E(q^i, \dot{q}^j) = d\alpha(q^i, \dot{q}^j), \quad (16)$$

where $\alpha(q^i, \dot{q}^j)$ is an arbitrary smooth function of $(q^i, \dot{q}^j)$ in $F(T^*M)$.

Secondly, if the Lagrangian L in (1) changes to L' by adding certain term

$$L(q^i, \dot{q}^j) \rightarrow L'(q^i, \dot{q}^j) = L(q^i, \dot{q}^j) + \mathcal{V}(q^i), \quad (17)$$

where $\mathcal{V}(q^i)$ is an arbitrary function of q^i , the equation (15) changes to

$$dL'_\epsilon(q^i_\epsilon, \dot{q}^i_\epsilon) |_{\epsilon^k=0} = E'(q^i, \dot{q}^i) + \frac{d}{dt}\theta, \quad (18)$$

where $E'(q^i, \dot{q}^i)$ differs from $E(q^i, \dot{q}^i)$ by changing L to L' in the expressions, while θ has not been changed because $\mathcal{V}$ does not depend on $\dot{q}^i$. In fact, the Euler-Lagrange equation has been changed by adding a potential-like term that does not depend on $\dot{q}^i$. This means that even if by adding a coboundary term, the Euler-Lagrange equation does change and canonical form may be still the same as before.

Thirdly, the Euler-Lagrange 1-forms are not coboundary in general since θ is not a coboundary. Therefore, we arrive at an important theorem for the classical Lagrangian mechanism [9][10] as follows.

Theorem 2.1

There exists a nontrivial Euler-Lagrange cohomology in the classical Lagrangian mechanism:

$$H_{CM} := \{ \text{closed Euler-Lagrange forms} \} / \{ \text{exact Euler-Lagrange forms} \}.$$

Furthermore, owing to the nilpotency of d with respect to ϵ^k in the cotangent space of the congruence on $F(T^*M)$,

$$d^2 L_\epsilon(q^i_\epsilon, \dot{q}^j_\epsilon) |_{\epsilon^k=0} = 0,$$

it follows that

$$dE(q^i, \dot{q}^i) + \frac{d}{dt}\omega_L = 0, \quad (19)$$

where ω_L is the symplectic structure in the Lagrangian formalism defined by

$$\omega_L = d\theta = \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \dot{q}^i \partial q^j} dq^i \wedge dq^j + \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \dot{q}^i \partial \dot{q}^j} dq^i \wedge d\dot{q}^j. \quad (20)$$

And it does not change if the canonical 1-form transforms as

$$\theta \rightarrow \theta' = \theta + d\beta(q^i, \dot{q}^i), \quad (21)$$

where $\beta(q^i, \dot{q}^i)$ is an arbitrary function of $(q^i, \dot{q}^i)$.

It is more important now that another important theorem in the classical Lagrangian mechanism [9] [10] can straightforwardly be established.

Theorem 2.2:

The symplectic structure ω_L exists and its preserving property, i.e. the symplectic conservation law with respect to t

$$\frac{d}{dt}\omega_L = 0 \quad (22)$$

holds *if and only if* the Euler-Lagrange 1-form is closed with respect to d in the function space $F(T^*M)$,

$$dE(q^i, \dot{q}^j) = 0. \quad (23)$$

The above closed condition has been named the (closed) Euler-Lagrange condition in [9][10].

The importance of the theorem 2.2 is to indicate that the preserving property of the symplectic structure ω_L that always exists in the classical Lagrangian mechanism is directly related to the Euler-Lagrange cohomology, especially to the closed Euler-Lagrange condition. On the other hand, the nontriviality of the Euler-Lagrange cohomology is given by the symplectic structure and its preserving property. It is simple to see from the cohomological point of view that although the null Euler-Lagrange 1-form, the coboundary Euler-Lagrange 1-forms satisfy the Euler-Lagrange condition, it does not mean that the closed Euler-Lagrange 1-forms can always be exact. Namely, as was mentioned above, it is guaranteed by the nontriviality of the Euler-Lagrange cohomology. This also indicates that $q^i(t)$, ($i = 1, \dots, n$), in the Euler-Lagrange condition are *NOT* in the solution space of the Euler-Lagrange equation only. In fact, they are still in the function space associated with the Euler-Lagrange condition in general. Therefore, as the theorem 2.2 claimed, the symplectic structure preserving property, i.e. the symplectic 2-form ω_L is conserved, holds not only in the solution space of the equation but also in the function space in general with respect to the duration of t if and only if the closed Euler-Lagrange condition is satisfied.

On the other hand, it is interesting to see that if we introduce a 2-form

$$\Omega(q^i, \dot{q}^i) = dE(q^i, \dot{q}^i), \quad (24)$$

then Ω may be viewed as a $U(1)$ -like curvature 2-form while the Euler-Lagrange 1-form the $U(1)$ -like connection 1-form. Therefore, the closed Euler-Lagrange condition is nothing but the flat connection condition. Furthermore, if for some reason that the symplectic conservation law is broken, the broken pattern may be described by the curvature 2-form Ω .

Finally, it should be pointed out that the Euler-Lagrange cohomological approach may directly be started from the Euler-Lagrange equation to define the associated Euler-Lagrange 1-form and release from the solution space, then by taking exterior derivative of the Euler-Lagrange 1-form the theorem 2.2 may also be established straightforwardly.

2.2 Euler-Lagrange cohomology and symplectic structure preserving in Hamiltonian formalism

The cohomological concepts, content and theorems in the last subsection for the Lagrangian formalism of the classical mechanics can also be well established in the Hamiltonian formalism.

In order to transfer to the Hamiltonian formalism, we introduce a family of conjugate momenta from the family of Lagrangian L_ϵ in (10)

$$p_{\epsilon j} = \frac{\partial L_\epsilon}{\partial \dot{q}_\epsilon^j}, \quad (25)$$

and take a Legendre transformation to get the Hamiltonian function in the family

$$H_\epsilon := H(q_\epsilon^i, p_{\epsilon j}) = p_{\epsilon k} \dot{q}_\epsilon^k - L(q_\epsilon^i, \dot{q}_\epsilon^j). \quad (26)$$

Then the exterior derivative of H_ϵ may be taken as the one with respect to the set of free parameters:

$$dH_\epsilon = \left(\frac{\partial H_\epsilon}{\partial p_{\epsilon i}} - \dot{q}_\epsilon^i \right) dp_{\epsilon i} + \left(\frac{\partial H_\epsilon}{\partial q_\epsilon^i} + \dot{p}_{\epsilon i} \right) dq_\epsilon^i + \dot{q}_\epsilon^i dp_{\epsilon i} - \dot{p}_{\epsilon i} dq_\epsilon^i. \quad (27)$$

A pair of the families Euler-Lagrange 1-forms now may be introduced as follows:

$$E_{\epsilon 1}(q_{\epsilon}^i, p_{\epsilon j}) = (\dot{p}_{\epsilon j} + \frac{\partial H_{\epsilon}}{\partial q_{\epsilon}^j})dq_{\epsilon}^j, \quad E_{\epsilon 2}(q_{\epsilon}^i, p_{\epsilon j}) = (\frac{\partial H_{\epsilon}}{\partial p_{\epsilon j}} - \dot{q}_{\epsilon}^j)dp_{\epsilon j}. \quad (28)$$

We may introduce a family of $z_{\epsilon^l}^T = (p_{\epsilon^l}^T, q_{\epsilon^l}^T), p_{\epsilon^l}^T = (p_{\epsilon^l 1}, \dots, p_{\epsilon^l n}), q_{\epsilon^l}^T = (q_{\epsilon^l}^1, \dots, q_{\epsilon^l}^n)$ defined by

$$z_{\epsilon^l}(t) := z(t) + \delta z_{\epsilon^l}(t) = z(t) + \epsilon^l \delta z_l(t), \quad (29)$$

where

$$\delta z_{\epsilon^l}(t) = \frac{d}{d\epsilon^l} \big|_{\epsilon^l=0} z_{\epsilon^l}(t) = \delta z_l(t)$$

is an infinitesimal variation of $z(t)$ along the direction l in the configuration space. Then the Euler-Lagrange 1-forms in (28) become

$$E_{\epsilon}(z_{\epsilon}, \dot{z}_{\epsilon}) = dz_{\epsilon}^T (\nabla_{z_{\epsilon}} H_{\epsilon} - J \dot{z}_{\epsilon}), \quad (30)$$

where J is a symplectic matrix.

It is straightforward to verify the following issues in Hamiltonian formalism:

First, the null Euler-Lagrange 1-forms by setting $\epsilon^l = 0$ give rise to a pair of the canonical equations as follows

$$\dot{q}^i = \frac{\partial H}{\partial p_i}, \quad \dot{p}_j = -\frac{\partial H}{\partial q^j}. \quad (31)$$

It is easy to see that the second equation comes from the definition of p_j and Legendre transformation with $\epsilon^l = 0$ while the first equation is associated with the Euler-Lagrange equation. In terms of z , we have

$$\dot{z} = J^{-1} \nabla_z H. \quad (32)$$

Secondly, the null forms are the special case of the coboundary Euler-Lagrange 1-forms, say,

$$E(z, \dot{z}) = d\alpha(z, \dot{z}), \quad (33)$$

where $\alpha(z, \dot{z})$ is an arbitrary function of $(z, \dot{z})$.

Thirdly, from either the expression of dH_{ϵ} or the definitions of the Euler-Lagrange 1-forms it is easy to see that the Euler-Lagrange 1-forms are not exact in general. Therefore, the Euler-Lagrange cohomology in the Hamiltonian formalism is also nontrivial as it should be .

Fourthly, by taking $d^2 H_{\epsilon} = 0$ and setting $\epsilon^k = 0$ afterwards, it is straightforward to get

$$dE(z, \dot{z}) + \frac{d}{dt} \omega_H = 0, \quad (34)$$

where ω_H is the symplectic structure ω_L transferred into the Hamiltonian formalism

$$\omega_H = \frac{1}{2} dz^T \wedge J dz. \quad (35)$$

Therefore, we have arrived at the following theorem in the Hamiltonian mechanism.

Theorem 2.3

In the Hamiltonian mechanism the symplectic structure ω_H preserving law

$$\frac{d}{dt}\omega_H = 0 \quad (36)$$

holds *if and only if* the Euler-Lagrange form is closed:

$$dE(z, \dot{z}) = 0, \quad i.e. \quad d(E_1(q^i, p_j) + E_2(q^i, p_j)) = 0. \quad (37)$$

Finally, it should be mentioned that as in the Lagrangian formalism the Euler-Lagrange cohomological scenario in the Hamiltonian formalism may also be performed in two slightly different processes. Namely, it may either start from the exterior derivative of the Hamiltonian or begin with the canonical equations. In the second process, the families of the Euler-Lagrange 1-forms (28) and (30) may be introduced directly from the canonical equations (31) and (32) respectively. Then by taking the exterior derivative of the families of the Euler-Lagrange 1-forms and setting the free parameters being vanish it also follows the theorem 2.3.

3 Euler-Lagrange Cohomology and Multisymplectic Structure Preserving in Classical Field Theory

We now consider the multisymplectic structure and its preserving property in classical field theory for a set of generic fields. Most important issue is about the Euler-Lagrange cohomology and its relation with the multisymplectic structure preserving property. We first consider the Lagrangian formalism and then transfer to the Hamiltonian formalism.

3.1 Euler-Lagrange cohomology and multisymplectic structure preserving for classical field theory in Lagrangian formalism

For the sake of simplicity, let $X^{(1,n-1)}$ be an n -dimensional Minkowskian space as base manifold with coordinates x^μ , ($\mu = 0, \dots, n-1$), M the configuration space on $X^{(1,n-1)}$ with a set of generic fields $u^i(x)$, ($i = 1, \dots, s$), TM the tangent bundle of M with coordinates (u^i, u_μ^j) , where $u_\mu^j = \frac{\partial u^j}{\partial x^\mu}$, $F(TM)$ the function space on TM etc. We also assume these fields to be free of constraints.

The Lagrangian of the fields now is a functional of the set of generic fields under consideration:

$$L(u^i, \dot{u}^i) = \int d^{n-1}x \mathcal{L}(u^i(\mathbf{x}, t), u_\mu^j(\mathbf{x}, t)), \quad u^i(x) = u^i(\mathbf{x}, t), \quad etc., \quad (38)$$

and the action is given by

$$S(u^i, u_\mu^i) = \int dt L(u^i, \dot{u}^i) = \int d^n x \mathcal{L}(u^i, u_\mu^i), \quad (39)$$

where $\mathcal{L}(u^i(\mathbf{x}, t), u_\mu^i(\mathbf{x}, t))$ is the Lagrangian density.

In order to apply Hamilton's principle we first consider how to define the variation of the action functional $S(u^i(x), u_\mu^i(x))$ in a manner analog to the case of classical mechanics.

In order to achieve this purpose, let us suppose that both $u^i(x)$ and $u_\mu^i(x)$ variate by an infinitesimal increments such that at a spacetime point of x the infinitesimal variations of u^i and u_μ^i can be described as follows

$$u_\epsilon^i(\mathbf{x}, t) = u^i(\mathbf{x}, t) + \epsilon^k \delta u_k^i(\mathbf{x}, t), \quad u_{\mu\epsilon}^j(\mathbf{x}, t) = u_\mu^j(\mathbf{x}, t) + \epsilon^k \delta u_{\mu k}^j(\mathbf{x}, t), \quad (40)$$

where ϵ^k are s free parameters along the k -th direction in the configuration space, and

$$\delta u_{\epsilon^k}^i(x) := \frac{d}{d\epsilon^l} \big|_{\epsilon^l=0} u_\epsilon^i(x) = \delta u_k^i(x), \quad \delta u_{\mu\epsilon}^j(x) := \frac{d}{d\epsilon^l} \big|_{\epsilon^l=0} u_{\mu\epsilon}^j(x) = \delta u_{\mu k}^j(x), \quad (41)$$

the infinitesimal increments of $u^i(\mathbf{x}, t)$ and $u_\mu^j(\mathbf{x}, t)$ at the spacetime point x respectively. Then the exterior derivatives of $u^i(\mathbf{x}, t)$ and $u_\mu^j(\mathbf{x}, t)$ at the spacetime point x may be defined as:

$$du_\epsilon^i := \frac{\partial u_\epsilon^i}{\partial \epsilon^l} d\epsilon^l = d\epsilon^k \delta u_k^i, \quad du_{\mu\epsilon}^j := \frac{\partial u_{\mu\epsilon}^j}{\partial \epsilon^l} d\epsilon^l = d\epsilon^k \delta u_{\mu k}^j. \quad (42)$$

It should be noticed that du_ϵ^i and $du_{\mu\epsilon}^j$ can be regarded as 1-forms with respect to $d\epsilon^k$.

Now, the Lagrangian becomes a family of Lagrangian functionals

$$L_\epsilon(u_\epsilon^i, \dot{u}_\epsilon^i) = \int d^{n-1}x \mathcal{L}(u_\epsilon^i(\mathbf{x}, t), u_{\mu\epsilon}^i(\mathbf{x}, t)), \quad (43)$$

and the action $S(u^i(x), u_\mu^i(x))$ also becomes a family of functionals

$$S_\epsilon = S(u_\epsilon^i(x), u_{\mu\epsilon}^i(x)). \quad (44)$$

Then the variation of the action can be defined as its differentiation with respect to ϵ^l and setting $\epsilon^l = 0$ afterwards. Namely,

$$\delta S := \frac{d}{d\epsilon^l} \big|_{\epsilon^l=0} S_\epsilon. \quad (45)$$

Manipulating the variation of the action functional in this manner and integrating by parts, it follows that

$$\delta S_\epsilon = \int d^n x \left\{ \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_\epsilon}{\partial u_\epsilon^i} - \partial_\mu \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_\epsilon}{\partial u_{\mu\epsilon}^i} \right) \right) \delta u_\epsilon^i + \partial_\mu \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial u_{\mu\epsilon}^i} \delta u_\epsilon^i \right) \right\}. \quad (46)$$

Assuming $\delta u_\epsilon^i|_{\pm\infty} = 0$, and requiring $\delta S_\epsilon = 0$ according to Hamilton's principle, then the Euler-Lagrange equation follows:

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial u^i} - \partial_\mu \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial u_\mu^i} \right) = 0. \quad (47)$$

On the other hand, the differentiation of the action functional with respect to the free parameters ϵ^l may be given by

$$dS_\epsilon = \int d^n x \left\{ \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_\epsilon}{\partial u_\epsilon^i} - \partial_\mu \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_\epsilon}{\partial u_{\mu\epsilon}^i} \right) \right) du_\epsilon^i + \partial_\mu \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial u_{\mu\epsilon}^i} du_\epsilon^i \right) \right\}. \quad (48)$$

It is important to notice that the integrant in the equation (48) reads:

$$d\mathcal{L}_\epsilon = \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_\epsilon}{\partial u_\epsilon^i} - \partial_\mu \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_\epsilon}{\partial u_{\mu\epsilon}^i} \right) \right) du_\epsilon^i + \partial_\mu \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial u_{\mu\epsilon}^i} du_\epsilon^i \right). \quad (49)$$

Let us define a family of the Euler-Lagrange 1-forms

$$E_\epsilon(u_\epsilon^i, u_{\mu\epsilon}^i) := \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_\epsilon}{\partial u_\epsilon^i} - \partial_\mu \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_\epsilon}{\partial u_{\mu\epsilon}^i} \right) \right) du_\epsilon^i, \quad (50)$$

and n families of 1-forms that each family corresponds to a set of canonical 1-forms

$$\theta_\epsilon^\mu := \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_\epsilon}{\partial u_{\mu\epsilon}^i} du_\epsilon^i. \quad (51)$$

Then the equation (49) becomes

$$d\mathcal{L}_\epsilon = E_\epsilon(u_\epsilon^i, u_{\mu\epsilon}^i) + \partial_\mu \theta_\epsilon^\mu. \quad (52)$$

Now, similar to the last section, it is easy to verify the following issues:

First, the null Euler-Lagrange 1-form with $\epsilon^l = 0$, i.e.

$$E_\epsilon(u_\epsilon^i, u_{\mu\epsilon}^i) |_{\epsilon^l=0} = 0 \quad (53)$$

gives rise to the Euler-Lagrange equation.

Secondly, $E_\epsilon(u_\epsilon^i, u_{\mu\epsilon}^i) = 0$ is a special case of the coboundary Euler-Lagrange 1-forms

$$E_\epsilon(u_\epsilon^i, u_{\mu\epsilon}^i) = d\alpha_\epsilon(u_\epsilon^i, u_{\mu\epsilon}^i), \quad (54)$$

where $\alpha_\epsilon(u_\epsilon^i, u_{\mu\epsilon}^i)$ a family of arbitrary functions of $(u_\epsilon^i, u_{\mu\epsilon}^i)$. Although they are cohomologically trivial but it can already be seen that in the Euler-Lagrange 1-forms, (u^i, u_μ^j) are already *NOT* in the solution space of the Euler-Lagrange equation only rather they are in the function space with the closed Euler-Lagrange condition (see below) in general.

Thirdly, if the Lagrangian density $\mathcal{L}$ in (43) changes to $\mathcal{L}'$ by adding certain term

$$\mathcal{L}(u^i, u_\mu^j) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}'(u^i, u_\mu^j) = \mathcal{L}(u^i, u_\mu^j) + \mathcal{V}(u^i), \quad (55)$$

where $\mathcal{V}(q^i)$ is an arbitrary function of u^i , the equation (49) changes to

$$d\mathcal{L}'_\epsilon |_{\epsilon^k=0} = E'(u^i, u_\mu^i) + \frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu} \theta^\mu, \quad (56)$$

where $E'(u^i, u_\mu^i)$ differs from $E(u^i, u_\mu^i)$ by changing $\mathcal{L}$ to $\mathcal{L}'$ in the expressions, while a set of n canonical 1-forms θ^μ have not been changed because $\mathcal{V}(u^i)$ does not depend on u_μ^i . In fact, the Euler-Lagrange equation has been changed by adding a potential-like term that does not depend on u_μ^i . This means that even if by adding a coboundary term, the Euler-Lagrange equation does change and the set of canonical forms may still be the same as before.

Fourthly, from the equation (56) it is easy to see that $E_\epsilon(u_\epsilon^i, u_{\mu\epsilon}^i)$ in general are not cohomologically trivial because the families of canonical 1-forms are not trivial. Therefore, the following theorem can be established [9] [10].

Theorem 3.1:

There exists a nontrivial Euler-Lagrange cohomology in the classical Lagrangian field theory for the set of generic fields $u^i(x)$:

$$H_{CFT} := \{ \text{closed Euler-Lagrange forms} \} / \{ \text{exact Euler-Lagrange forms} \}.$$

Furthermore, due to the nilpotency of d with respect to ϵ^k , taking the second exterior derivative of $\mathcal{L}_\epsilon(u_\epsilon^i, u_{\mu\epsilon}^i)$ and setting $\epsilon^k = 0$ afterwards

$$d^2 \mathcal{L}_\epsilon(u_\epsilon^i, u_{\mu\epsilon}^i) |_{\epsilon^k=0} = 0,$$

it follows that

$$dE(u^i, u_\mu^i) + \frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu} \omega^\mu = 0, \quad (57)$$

where ω^μ are n symplectic structures defined by

$$\omega^\mu = d\theta^\mu = \frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial u_\mu^i \partial u^j} du^j \wedge du^i + \frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial u_\mu^i \partial u_\nu^j} du_\nu^j \wedge du^i. \quad (58)$$

And they do not change if the set of n canonical 1-forms transform as

$$\theta^\mu \rightarrow \theta^{\mu'} = \theta^\mu + d\beta(u^i, u_\mu^i), \quad (59)$$

where $\beta(u^i, u_\mu^i)$ is an arbitrary function of (u^i, u_μ^i) .

Then it is now straightforward to get another important theorem in the classical Lagrangian field theory [9] [10].

Theorem 3.2:

There exists a set of n symplectic structures ω^μ and the multisymplectic preserving property, i.e. the conservation or divergence free law of the multisymplectic structures

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu} \omega^\mu = 0 \quad (60)$$

holds *if and only if* the Euler-Lagrange 1-form is closed

$$dE(u^i, u_\mu^j) = 0. \quad (61)$$

Similar to the finite dimensional case, it is interesting to see that if we introduce a new 2-form

$$\Omega(u^i, u_\mu^i) = dE(u^i, u_\mu^j). \quad (62)$$

It is easy to see that Ω may be viewed as a $U(1)$ -like curvature 2-form while the Euler-Lagrange 1-form the $U(1)$ -like connection 1-form. Therefore, the closed Euler-Lagrange condition is nothing but the flat connection condition. On the other hand, if for some reason that the multisymplectic conservation law is broken then the broken pattern may be described by the curvature 2-form Ω .

It is also important to notice that the multisymplectic structure preserving property is directly linked with the closed Euler-Lagrange condition. And although the null Euler-Lagrange 1-form, the coboundary Euler-Lagrange 1-forms satisfy the Euler-Lagrange condition, it does not mean that the closed Euler-Lagrange 1-forms can always be exact as was pointed out above. In addition, $u^i(x)$'s in the Euler-Lagrange condition are *NOT* in the solution space of the Euler-Lagrange equation only in general. Therefore, the multisymplectic structure preserving property, i.e. the conservation law of the set of n symplectic 2-forms ω^μ , holds not only in the solution space of the equation but also in the function space with the closed Euler-Lagrange condition in general.

3.2 Euler-Lagrange cohomology and multisymplectic structure preserving for classical field theory in Hamiltonian formalism

The most concepts, content and theorems in the last subsection for the Lagrangian field theory of a set of the classical generic fields can also be well established in the Hamiltonian formalism. In order to apply the Euler-Lagrange cohomological approach to Hamiltonian formalism for the classical field theory with a set of generic fields, we first have to define a "momentum" that is canonically conjugate to the field variables

$$\pi_j(x) = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \dot{u}^j}, \quad (63)$$

and take a Legendre transformation to get the Hamiltonian density

$$\mathcal{H}(u^i, \pi_j) = \pi_k(x) \dot{u}^k(x) - \mathcal{L}(u^i, \dot{u}^j). \quad (64)$$

The Hamiltonian then is given by

$$H(t) = \int d^{n-1} x \mathcal{H}(x), \quad (65)$$

with the Legendre transformation

$$H(t) = \int d^{n-1} x \pi_k(x) \dot{u}^k(x) - L(t). \quad (66)$$

From the Legendre transformation, it follows one of a pair field equations in canonical formalism

$$\dot{u}^k(x) = \frac{\partial \mathcal{H}}{\partial \pi_k(x)}, \quad (67)$$

$$\dot{\pi}_k(x) = -\frac{\partial \mathcal{H}}{\partial u^k(x)} + \nabla_a \frac{\partial \mathcal{H}}{\partial (\nabla_a u^k(x))}, \quad a = 1, \dots, n-1. \quad (68)$$

The second equation (68) comes from the Euler-Lagrange equation.

Now we may introduce a pair of the Euler-Lagrange 1-forms associated with the pair of the canonical equations in the Hamiltonian formalism

$$E_1 = d\pi_k \left\{ \frac{\partial \mathcal{H}}{\partial \pi_k(x)} - \dot{u}^k(x) \right\}, \quad E_2 = du^k \left\{ \dot{\pi}_k(x) + \frac{\partial \mathcal{H}}{\partial u^k(x)} - \nabla_a \frac{\partial \mathcal{H}}{\partial (\nabla_a u^k(x))} \right\}. \quad (69)$$

It is straightforward to prove the following formula:

$$d(E_1 + E_2) = \partial_t \omega^0 - \nabla_a \omega^a, \quad (70)$$

where ω^0 and ω^a , $a = 1, \dots, n-1$, a set of n symplectic 2-forms

$$\omega^0 = d\pi_k \wedge du^k, \quad \omega^a = d\left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{H}}{\partial (\nabla_a u^k(x))}\right) \wedge du^k. \quad (71)$$

Now we may establish the following theorem for the multisymplectic structure conservation law in the Hamiltonian formalism for classical field theory with a set of generic fields.

Theorem 3.3:

In the Hamiltonian formalism for classical field theory of a set of generic fields $u^i(x)$ on n -dimensional Minkowskian spacetime there exists a set of n symplectic 2-forms ω^0 and $\omega^a, a = 1, \dots, n-1$, and the multisymplectic structure preserving law, i.e. their conservation law,

$$\partial_t \omega^0 - \nabla_a \omega^a = 0, \quad a = 1, \dots, n-1, \quad (72)$$

holds if and only if $E_1 + E_2$ is closed. Namely,

$$d(E_1 + E_2) = 0. \quad (73)$$

It should be noticed that here the exterior derivatives of Es , i.e. dEs , have been taken and it should be understood as the exterior calculus in the generic function space such that $d : \Omega^k \rightarrow \Omega^{k+1}$ with $d^2 = 0$ (see, for example, [14]). On the other hand, it may be more directly regarded as the exterior differentiation in the configuration space in the sense of last subsection. Namely, introducing a set of free parameters $\epsilon^l, l = 1, \dots, s$, such that each variable and functional etc becomes a family of relevant objects with respect to the free parameters, then the exterior differentiation in the configuration space may be manipulated as the one with respect to the free parameters ϵ^l and finally, after all calculations are completed, setting $\epsilon^l = 0$.

It should also be pointed out that in the above content of this subsection, the Euler-Lagrange cohomological approach starts from the canonical equations and the introduction of the Euler-Lagrange 1-form(s) is associated with the canonical equations, while the symplectic structure and its conservation law are derived from the exterior derivative of the Euler-Lagrange 1-forms. The entire scenario seems, at least superficially, to be nothing related with the exterior derivative of Hamiltonian. However, the scenario may also begin with the exterior derivative of Hamiltonian that is analog with the case in the Hamiltonian mechanism. Let us describe this issue in what follows.

In order to more directly take the exterior derivative of Hamiltonian we introduce a family of Hamiltonian functionals

$$H_\epsilon(t) = \int d^{n-1}x \mathcal{H}_\epsilon(x). \quad (74)$$

and make the Legendre transformation in the family as well

$$\mathcal{H}_\epsilon(u_\epsilon^i, \pi_{\epsilon j}) = \pi_{\epsilon k}(x) \dot{u}_\epsilon^k(x) - \mathcal{L}_\epsilon(u_\epsilon^i, \dot{u}_\epsilon^j). \quad (75)$$

Then the exterior derivatives of Hamiltonian may be taken as the differentiation of $H_\epsilon(t)$ with respect to ϵ as follows

$$\begin{aligned} dH_\epsilon(t) &= \int d^{n-1}x d\mathcal{H}_\epsilon(u_\epsilon^i, \pi_{\epsilon j}) \\ &= \int d^{n-1}x \left\{ \frac{\partial \mathcal{H}_\epsilon}{\partial \pi_{\epsilon j}} d\pi_{\epsilon j} + \frac{\partial \mathcal{H}_\epsilon}{\partial u_\epsilon^i} du_\epsilon^i - \nabla_a \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{H}_\epsilon}{\partial (\nabla_a u_\epsilon^i)} \right) du_\epsilon^i + \nabla_a \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{H}_\epsilon}{\partial (\nabla_a u_\epsilon^i)} \right) du_\epsilon^i \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Now we introduce a pair of families of the Euler-Lagrange 1-forms

$$E_{\epsilon 1} = d\pi_{\epsilon k} \left\{ \frac{\partial \mathcal{H}_\epsilon}{\partial \pi_{\epsilon k}(x)} - \dot{u}_\epsilon^k(x) \right\}, \quad E_{\epsilon 2} = du_\epsilon^k \left\{ \dot{\pi}_{\epsilon k}(x) + \frac{\partial \mathcal{H}_\epsilon}{\partial u_\epsilon^k(x)} - \nabla_a \frac{\partial \mathcal{H}_\epsilon}{\partial (\nabla_a u_\epsilon^k(x))} \right\}, \quad (76)$$

and

$$\theta_\epsilon^0 = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} u_\epsilon^l d\pi_{\epsilon l} - \frac{\partial \pi_{\epsilon l}}{\partial t} du_\epsilon^l, \quad \theta_\epsilon^a = \nabla_a \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{H}_\epsilon}{\partial (\nabla_a u_\epsilon^k)} du_\epsilon^k \right). \quad (77)$$

Hence $dH_\epsilon(t)$ becomes

$$dH_\epsilon(t) = \int d^{n-1}x \{E_{\epsilon 1} + E_{\epsilon 2} + \theta_\epsilon^0 + \theta_\epsilon^a\}. \quad (78)$$

Taking the second exterior derivative of $H(t)$, due to the nilpotency of d , it follows that

$$d(E_{\epsilon 1} + E_{\epsilon 2}) + \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \omega_\epsilon^0 - \nabla_a \omega_\epsilon^a = 0, \quad (79)$$

where

$$\omega_\epsilon^0 = du_\epsilon^k \wedge d\pi_{\epsilon k} \quad \omega_\epsilon^a = du_\epsilon^k \wedge d\left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{H}_\epsilon}{\partial (\nabla_a u_\epsilon^k)}\right). \quad (80)$$

By setting $\epsilon^l = 0$, we re-derive the theorem 3.3.

4 Cohomological Approach to Hamiltonian-like ODEs, PDEs and Their Symplectic and Multisymplectic Properties

As was mentioned above, it is worthwhile to notice that in the previous sections there are some slight differences between two Euler-Lagrange cohomological approaches in both Lagrangian and Hamiltonian formalism for classical mechanism and classical field theory.

In one of the approaches the cohomological scenario starts from the variation of the action functional in Lagrangian formalism or the exterior derivative of the Hamiltonian functional in Hamiltonian formalism so that the exterior derivative of the Lagrangian dL or that of the Hamiltonian dH in the function space gives rise to the relation between the Euler-Lagrange form and the divergence of the canonical 1-form(s) that exhibits the nontriviality of the Euler-Lagrange forms and the cohomology. Then $d^2L = 0$ or $d^2H = 0$ leads to the theorem on that the closed Euler-Lagrange condition is the necessary and sufficient condition for the symplectic and multisymplectic structure preserving laws in classical mechanism and field theory respectively.

In another approach, however, the Euler-Lagrange cohomological scenario may directly begin with the definition of the Euler-Lagrange 1-form(s) associated with the Euler-Lagrange equation or the canonical equations. The nontriviality of the Euler-Lagrange cohomology originates from the principal parts of the Euler-Lagrange equation or the canonical equations that lead to the one(s) in the Euler-Lagrange 1-form(s) that are essentially same as the canonical 1-form(s) in each case. Then the exterior derivatives of the Euler-Lagrange 1-forms establish the relation between the closed Euler-Lagrange condition and the conservation laws of the symplectic and the multisymplectic structures in the classical mechanism and field theory respectively.

As a matter of fact, although the essentials of the two approaches are almost the same, these slight differences however also indicate that for certain types of given ODEs and PDEs no matter whether the associated Lagrangian and/or Hamiltonian exist or not, the

cohomological scenario may directly be applied to them by starting with the introduction of the relevant what will be called the Euler-Lagrange-like 1-forms or symplecticity 1-forms, and progressing further to see whether there exist what may be called the Euler-Lagrange-like, or symplectic cohomology, symplectic/multisymplectic structures and their preserving laws. In other words, the Euler-Lagrange-like cohomological, or the symplectic cohomological, scenario may directly be applied to certain types of ODEs and PDEs that may be named the Hamiltonian-like ODEs and PDEs respectively.

In what follows, we first explore how to apply the cohomological approach to the type of Hamiltonian-like ODEs in subsection 4.1. Then we deal with the type of Hamiltonian-like PDEs in subsection 4.2. We show that so-called the type of Hamiltonian PDEs introduced in [4] is just a case of Hamiltonian-like PDEs. We also show that in each case there always exist Lagrangian/Hamiltonian-like functional for the Hamiltonian-like ODEs and PDEs respectively such that the vanishing variational of the action-like functional that is integral of the relevant Lagrangian-like functional may always lead to the corresponding Hamiltonian-like ODEs or PDEs.

4.1 Symplectic cohomological approach to Hamiltonian-like ODEs and their symplectic structure preserving law

In this subsection, we explore this aspect and show that the Euler-Lagrange-like, or symplectic cohomological approach is available for certain types of Hamiltonian-like ODEs. We also furnish these ODEs with what is called the Lagrangian-like or the Hamiltonian-like functional and show that these ODEs may be derived from what may be called Hamilton-like's principle for an action-like functional that is given by the integral of the Lagrangian-like functional.

We first consider a type of ODEs that may be viewed as the variety of a pair of the canonical equations (31) in classical mechanics as follows

$$\dot{q}^i = \frac{\partial \mathcal{H}}{\partial p_i}, \quad \dot{p}_j = -\frac{\partial \mathcal{H}}{\partial q^j}, \quad (81)$$

where $\mathcal{H}$ differs with H by an arbitrary smooth enough function of p_j, q^i on the phase space. Then it is straightforward to verify that the same cohomology associated with the original Hamiltonian system also available to this case.

Let us further consider the following type of ODEs that is a mimic of (32):

$$J\dot{z} = \nabla_z S(z), \quad (82)$$

where J a symplectic matrix $z(t)$ the dependent variables no matter whether it is the canonical variables on the phase space, $S(z)$ an arbitrary smooth enough function of $z(t)$ no matter whether it is a Hamiltonian.

It is known from the previous sections that the cohomological scenario may be begun with introducing the Euler-Lagrange-like 1-form associated to the ODEs. In order to do so, we assume that the solution space of the ODE exists and release all dependent variables $z(t)$ from the solution space by some infinitesimal variations described by a set of free parameters. For example, the variables $z(t)$ may be changed to

$$z(t) \rightarrow z_\epsilon(t) = z(t) + \epsilon^l \delta z_l, \quad (83)$$

where δz_l is an infinitesimal variation of z along the direction l in the function space, and so on. Then the exterior derivative of z in the function space may be taken as the one with respect to the free parameters ϵ^l as follows

$$dz := dz_\epsilon = \frac{\partial z_\epsilon}{\partial \epsilon^l} d\epsilon^l = d\epsilon^l \delta z_l. \quad (84)$$

In what follows, all exterior derivatives in the function space are taken in this sense. And for the sake of simplicity, the omission of the ϵ^l will be taken without mentioning.

Now we are ready to introduce the Euler-Lagrange-like 1-form associated to the ODEs:

$$E(z, \dot{z}) := dz^T \{J\dot{z} - \nabla_z S(z)\}. \quad (85)$$

It is easy to see that the null Euler-Lagrange-like 1-form gives rise to the type of ODEs (82) and it is a special case of the coboundary Euler-Lagrange-like 1-forms

$$E(z, \dot{z}) = d\alpha(z, \dot{z}), \quad (86)$$

where $\alpha(z, \dot{z})$ is an arbitrary function of $(z, \dot{z})$.

By taking the exterior derivative d of the Euler-Lagrange-like 1-form, it is straightforward to prove that

$$dE(z, \dot{z}) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \omega, \quad \omega = dz^T \wedge J dz. \quad (87)$$

where ω is formally the same as ω_H as it should be if z rely on the phase space. This means that the following symplectic structure preserving equation

$$\frac{d}{dt} \omega = 0 \quad (88)$$

holds *if and only if* the Euler-Lagrange-like 1-form is closed:

$$dE(z, \dot{z}) = 0. \quad (89)$$

It should also be mentioned that the following issues can easily be verified. From the definition of the Euler-Lagrange-like 1-form (85), it follows the nontriviality of the Euler-Lagrange-like 1-form in general since the first term in the definition is the mimic of the canonical 1-form that is obviously not trivial so that a nontrivial Euler-Lagrange-like cohomology, or the symplectic cohomology, associated with this type of ODEs can be introduced

$$H_{ODE} := \{ \text{closed Euler-Lagrange-like forms} \} / \{ \text{exact Euler-Lagrange-like forms} \}.$$

In fact, if the variables $z(t)$ are canonical variables, this type of ODEs (82) is the same as (81) so that they share the same cohomology with the canonical equation (31) and (32). As a matter of fact, as was pointed, in this case the Euler-Lagrange-like form (85) and the Euler-Lagrange form (30) associated with the canonical equation (32) differ by an exact form.

In addition, similar to all cases in the classical mechanism, the symplectic structure preserving law holds not only in the solution space of the ODEs but also in the function space associated with the Euler-Lagrange-like cohomology.

Finally, in the case of $z(t)$ is not the canonical coordinates and momenta, let us consider how to introduce the action-like functional for this type of ODEs. Regarding the function

$S(z)$ as a Hamiltonian-like function and introducing a Lagrangian-like functional $L(z, \dot{z})$ by

$$L(z, \dot{z}) = \frac{1}{2} \dot{z}^T J \dot{z} - S(z), \quad (90)$$

then a action-like functional $A(z)$ may be introduced as follows

$$A(z) = \int_a^b dt L(z, \dot{z}). \quad (91)$$

The variation of the action-like functional may also manipulated as the differentiation with respect to the free parameters

$$\delta A(t) := \frac{d}{d\epsilon^k} A_\epsilon(t) \big|_{\epsilon^k=0} = \int_a^b dt \frac{d}{d\epsilon^k} L_\epsilon(z_\epsilon, \dot{z}_\epsilon) \big|_{\epsilon^k=0}.$$

On the other hand, it is straightforward to calculate that

$$dL_\epsilon = dz_\epsilon^T (J d\dot{z}_\epsilon - \nabla_{z_\epsilon} S_\epsilon(z_\epsilon)) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} (z_\epsilon^T J dz_\epsilon). \quad (92)$$

Then the Hamilton-like's principle leads to the original ODE (82) and $d^2 L_\epsilon \big|_{\epsilon=0} = 0$ gives rise to the following wanted identity:

$$dE(z, \dot{z}) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \omega = 0, \quad \omega = dz^T \wedge J dz. \quad (93)$$

Furthermore, we even may progress further to some type of ODEs that mimic the canonical equation(s) in the Hamiltonian mechanism. For example, the equation (82) may be generalized to the following type of Hamiltonian-like ODEs:

$$K \dot{f}(t) = \nabla_f S(f), \quad (94)$$

where K is any $n \times n$, $n = 2k + 1$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ antisymmetric nonsingular matrix, $f(t)$ an $n \times 1$ matrix variables, $S(f)$ an arbitrary smooth enough function of f .

The symplectic cohomological scenario may also begin with by introducing the associated Euler-Lagrange-like 1-form

$$E(f, \dot{f}) := df^T (K \dot{f}(t) - \nabla_f S(f)). \quad (95)$$

Taking the exterior derivative of the Euler-Lagrange-like 1-form, it follows for this type of Hamiltonian-like ODEs that

$$dE(f, \dot{f}) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} df^T \wedge K df = 0. \quad (96)$$

Namely, $\tau = df^T \wedge K df$ is a symplectic structure associated with this type of Hamiltonian-like ODEs and it is conserved *if and only if* $dE(f, \dot{f}) = 0$.

Similarly, the following issues can be verified. First, the null Euler-Lagrange-like 1-form gives rise to the Hamiltonian-like ODEs (94) and it is a special case of the coboundary Euler-Lagrange-like 1-forms. Secondly, the definition of (95) shows that the Euler-Lagrange-like 1-form is nontrivial since the first term in it is a mimicry of the canonical

1-form in the Hamiltonian mechanism so that there is a nontrivial Euler-Lagrange-like cohomology, or the symplectic cohomology, associated to this type of Hamiltonian-like ODEs. Thirdly, the symplectic structure preserving equation can be derived here by taking exterior derivative of the Euler-Lagrange-like 1-form. And it is not dependant on the solution space of the type of Hamiltonian-like ODEs in general but can be applied to their solution space. In fact, the symplectic structure preserving equation holds not only in the solution space of the ODEs but also in the function space relevant to the Euler-Lagrange-like cohomology as well. Finally, the action-like functional for this type of ODEs may be found as follows

$$A(t) = \int_a^b dt L(f, \dot{f}), \quad L(f, \dot{f}) = \frac{1}{2} \dot{f}^T K \dot{f} - S(f). \quad (97)$$

4.2 Symplectic cohomological approach to Hamiltonian-like PDEs and their multisymplectic structure preserving law

We now consider the application of the cohomological approach to Hamiltonian-like PDEs and their multisymplectic structure preserving law. It is worthwhile to emphasize that analog to the case of classical mechanism, for a kind of given PDEs no matter the associated Lagrangian and/or Hamiltonian are known or not, the cohomological scenario may directly be applied to them by starting with the introduction of the associated Euler-Lagrange-like 1-forms and progressing further to see whether the Euler-Lagrange-like cohomology, multisymplectic structures and their preserving law exist. In other words, the Euler-Lagrange-like cohomological scenario may directly be applied to the PDEs. Similar to the case of the Hamiltonian-like ODEs, this type of PDEs may be called the Hamiltonian-like PDEs.

Let us first consider the variety of the Hamiltonian PDEs for field theory as follows:

$$\dot{u}^k(x) = \frac{\partial \mathcal{H}'}{\partial \pi_k(x)}, \quad (98)$$

$$\dot{\pi}_k(x) = -\frac{\partial \mathcal{H}'}{\partial u^k(x)} + \nabla_a \frac{\partial \mathcal{H}'}{\partial (\nabla_a u^k(x))}, \quad a = 1, \dots, n-1, \quad (99)$$

where $\mathcal{H}'$ differ from $\mathcal{H}$ by an arbitrary function of u^i, π^i :

$$\mathcal{H}' = \mathcal{H} + \gamma(u^i, \pi^i), \quad (100)$$

where $\gamma(u^i, \pi^i)$ is an arbitrary function of (u^i, π^i) .

Then it is straightforward to verify that the set of PDEs (98) and (99) have the similar Euler-Lagrange cohomology and share the same multisymplectic conservation law with the set of canonical equations (67) and (68) for classical field theory in Hamiltonian formalism.

We now consider the following type of so called the Hamiltonian PDEs introduced first by Bridges through the hypothesis that adding certain term to canonical equation of motion (an ODE that is symplectic preserving) in Hamiltonian mechanism [4]. We will make use of the similar notations in [4] [8] [15]

$$M z_{x_1} + \epsilon K z_{x_2} = \nabla_z S, \quad \epsilon = \pm 1, \quad (101)$$

where M and K are any antisymmetrical matrixes and

$$z_{x_i} = \frac{\partial z}{\partial x_i}, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

Introducing the Euler-Lagrange-like 1-form

$$E(z, z_{x_1}, z_{x_2}) := dz^T \{Mz_{x_1} + \epsilon Kz_{x_2} - \nabla_z S\}, \quad (102)$$

it is easy to see that the null Euler-Lagrange-like 1-form gives rise to the type of equations (101) and it is a special case of the coboundary Euler-Lagrange-like 1-forms

$$E(z, z_{x_1}, z_{x_2}) = d\alpha(z, z_{x_1}, z_{x_2}), \quad (103)$$

where $\alpha(z, z_{x_1}, z_{x_2})$ is an arbitrary function of (z, z_{x_1}, z_{x_2}) .

Now by taking the exterior derivative d of the Euler-Lagrange-like 1-form, it is straightforward to prove that

$$dE(z, z_{x_1}, z_{x_2}) + \frac{1}{2}\partial_{x_1}(dz^T \wedge Mdz) + \epsilon \frac{1}{2}\partial_{x_2}(dz^T \wedge Kdz) = 0. \quad (104)$$

This means that the following multisymplectic structure preserving equation

$$\partial_{x_1}\omega + \epsilon\partial_{x_2}\tau = 0, \quad (105)$$

where

$$\omega = dz^T \wedge Mdz, \quad \tau = dz^T \wedge Kdz, \quad (106)$$

holds *if and only if* the Euler-Lagrange-like 1-form is closed, i.e.

$$dE(z, z_{x_1}, z_{x_2}) = 0. \quad (107)$$

It should be mentioned that first from the definition of the Euler-Lagrange-like 1-form (102), it is not trivial in general since the first two terms in the definition are the canonical 1-forms which are obviously not trivial so that a nontrivial cohomology associated with this type of Hamiltonian-like PDEs can be introduced

$$H_{PDE} := \{\text{closed Euler-Lagrange-like forms}\} / \{\text{exact Euler-Lagrange-like forms}\}.$$

Secondly, the multisymplectic structure preserving equation derived here is not dependant on the solution space of the type of Hamiltonian-like PDEs in general but can be applied to the type of Hamiltonian-like PDEs so that it is held not only in the solution space of the PDEs but also in the function space relevant to the cohomology as well.

Thirdly, this type of Hamiltonian-like PDEs can directly be generalized to the higher dimensional space/spacetime cases.

Fourthly, the action-like functional for this type of PDEs may be introduced as follows

$$A(t) = \int_a^b dx^2 \mathcal{L}(z, z_{x_1}, z_{x_2}), \quad (108)$$

where the Lagrangian-like functional is given by

$$\mathcal{L}(z, z_{x_1}, z_{x_2}) = \frac{1}{2}z^T(Mz_{x_1} + \epsilon Kz_{x_2}) - S(z). \quad (109)$$

It is straightforward to prove that the vanishing variation of $A(t)$ leads to the original PDEs (102).

Finally, it is straightforward to generalize this type of Hamiltonian-like PDEs to higher dimensional case.

5 Remarks

A few remarks are in order:

1. The approach presented in the previous paper by Guo, Li and Wu [9], in the talk [10] and in this paper to the symplectic or multisymplectic geometry for classical mechanism and classical field theory in the Lagrangian and Hamiltonian formalisms respectively is more or less different from other approaches (see, for example, [4] [7]). The Euler-Lagrange cohomological concepts and relevant content such as the Euler-Lagrange 1-forms, the null Euler-Lagrange 1-forms, the coboundary Euler-Lagrange 1-forms as well as the (closed) Euler-Lagrange conditions have been introduced and they have played very crucial roles in each case to show that the symplectic or the multisymplectic structure and the relevant preserving property hold in the function space with the relevant Euler-Lagrange condition in general rather than in the solution space of the equation(s) of motion only. It has been emphasized that the Euler-Lagrange cohomology in each relevant case is nontrivial and it is very closely related to the symplectic or multisymplectic structures as well as the relevant preserving property. As a matter of fact, these two aspects, i.e. the Euler-Lagrange cohomology vs. the symplectic or multisymplectic structure preserving, are two sides of the same coin in some sense.

It should be pointed out that the content of the Euler-Lagrange cohomology and the role played by the cohomology in each case should be further studied not only in classical level but also in quantum level as well. And needless to say, this cohomological scenario should also be generalized to the case with more generic base manifolds and configuration spaces and applied to whatever the least variational principle and the Euler-Lagrange equation are available, such as the mechanics and field theory with different types of constraints, different types of field theories and so on so forth.

2. It should be emphasized as was mentioned in the content that the approach with the Euler-Lagrange cohomological concepts can also be directly applied to certain types of Hamiltonian-like ODEs and PDEs no matter whether they have known Lagrangian and/or Hamiltonian associated with. And we have found that if the cohomological approach works for the Hamiltonian-like ODEs and PDEs, may also be found some artificial action-like functional, Lagrangian-like functional and Hamiltonian-like functional associated with them in certain sense that the Hamilton-like's principle may be applied to get the original ODEs and PDEs. On the other hand, from the symplectic cohomological point of view, with in the same cohomology class, those ODEs and PDEs may differ by some exact forms respectively.

This kind of cohomological approach to ODEs and PDEs should also be paid more attention and to explore further the content and generalization. On the other hand, if the cohomological approach works for the Hamiltonian-like ODEs and PDEs, it is still interesting to see whether these ODEs and PDEs may be prolonged in certain manner to find even artificially some more realistic Lagrangian and/or Hamiltonian functional associated with them.

3. The difference discrete variational principle, difference discretized version of the Euler-Lagrange cohomology, symplectic/multisymplectic structure and the relevant preserving property for the classical mechanism and classical field theory mainly in discrete Lagrangian formalism have also been studied and have been applied to the symplectic algorithm and the multisymplectic algorithm [9] [10] [11] as well as the symplectic-

tic/multisymplectic structure preserving in the finite element method [12] [13]. Some new results on these issues have been established by the present authors. We will present our results elsewhere [16].

4. Finally, it should also be emphasized that there exist lots of other problems to be studied on the Euler-Lagrange cohomology and related topics not only in mathematics but also in physics. For instance, the relation between the Euler-Lagrange cohomology and the second variation of the action functional, the relation between the Euler-Lagrange cohomology and the problems on the existence and stability of the solutions of the Euler-Lagrange equations, Hamiltonian-like ODEs and PDEs, the relation between the symplectic group or algebraic symmetry cohomology and the Euler-Lagrange cohomology, the symplectic/multisymplectic structure preserving properties, the physical application of the Euler-Lagrange cohomology, symplectic and multisymplectic structure conservation laws and so on so forth.

Acknowledgements

Guo, Li and Wu would like to thank Professors and/or Drs J. Butcher, Y.B. Dai, J.B. Chen, J.L. Hong, A. Iserles R.I. McLachlan, D. Lewis, H. Munthe-Kaas, P. Olver, B.R. Owren, M.Z. Qin, S. Reich, Z.J. Shang, X.C. Song, G. Sun, Y.F. Tang, L.H. Wang, S.H. Wang, M. West, Z. Xu for valuable discussions and comments, specially during the International Workshop on Structure-Preserving Algorithms, March 25-31, 2001, Beijing. This work is partly supported by National Science Foundation of China.

References

- [1] V.I. Arnold, Mathematical Methods of Classical Mechanics, Graduate texts in Math. **60** (1978), (Second Ed.) Springer-Verlag, (1989).
- [2] R. Abraham and J.E. Marsden, Foundation of Mechanics, (1978), (Second Ed.) Addison-Wesley.
- [3] E. Binz, J. Śniatycki and H. Ficher, Geometry of Classical Fields, North Holland Elsevier, Amsterdam, 1988.
- [4] T.J. Bridges, Multisymplectic Structures and Wave Propagation, Math. Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc. 121 (1997) 147-190.
- [5] M. Gotay, J. Isenberg and J.E. Marsden, Momentum Maps and the Hamiltonian Structure of Classical Relativistic Field Theories, (1997) Preprint.
- [6] J.E. Marsden and S. Shkoller, Multisymplectic Geometry, Covariant Hamiltonian and Water Waves, Math. Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc. 124 (1998).
- [7] J.E. Marsden, G. W. Patrick and S. Shkoller, Multisymplectic Geometry, Variational Integrators, and Nonlinear PDEs, Comm. Math. Phys. 199 (1998) 351-395.
- [8] T.J. Bridges and S. Reich, Multi-Symplectic Integrators: numerical schemes for Hamiltonian PDEs that conserve symplecticity, Feb. 1999. Preprint.

- [9] H.Y. Guo, Y.Q. Li and K. Wu, On Symplectic and Multisymplectic Structures and Their Discrete Versions in Lagrangian Formalism, Preprint AS-ITP-2001-006, March, 2001. hep-ph/0104064.
- [10] H.Y. Guo, Symplectic, Multisymplectic Structures and the Euler-Lagrange Cohomology, Talk given at The International Workshop on Structure-Preserving Algorithms, March 25-31, 2001, Beijing.
- [11] H.Y. Guo, Y.Q. Li and K. Wu, A Note on Symplectic Algorithms, Preprint AS-ITP-2001-007, March, 2001. physics/0104030.
- [12] H.Y. Guo, X.M. Ji, Y.Q. Li and K. Wu, A Note on Symplectic, Multisymplectic Schemes in Finite Element Method, Preprint AS-ITP-2001-008, March, 2001. hep-th/0104060.
- [13] K. Wu, Symplectic and Multisymplectic 2-form Structures in Simple Finite Element Method, Talk given at The International Workshop on Structure-Preserving Algorithms, March 25-31, 2001, Beijing.
- [14] A. Connes, Noncommutative Geometry, Academic Press, INC. 1994.
- [15] S. Reich, Multisymplectic Runge-Kutta Collocation Methods for Hamiltonian Wave Equations, J. Comput. Phys. 157 (2000), 473-499.
- [16] H.Y. Guo, Y.Q. Li, K. Wu and S.K. Wang, In preparation.